

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X		
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	:	
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	25 Civ. 215 (JSR) (GS)
	:	
- against -	:	<u>ORDER</u>
	:	
GLOBAL BUSINESS TRAVEL GROUP,	:	
INC. and CWT HOLDINGS, LLC,	:	
	:	
Defendants.	:	
-----X		

GARY STEIN, United States Magistrate Judge:

The Court will shortly issue, under temporary seal (at the “selected parties” viewing level), an Opinion and Order (“O&O”) addressing the Government’s motion to compel the production of purportedly privileged documents clawed back by Defendant Global Business Travel Group, Inc. (“GBT”) as having been inadvertently produced during the pre-complaint investigation. (Dkt. No. 105). The O&O discusses the parties’ letters and other submissions in support of or opposition to the Government’s motion, all of which were filed under seal. (*See* Dkt. Nos. 105, 107, 108, 109, 113, 114).

The Government and GBT (“the parties”) are hereby directed as follows:

First, to the extent that the parties wish to maintain the aforementioned filings under seal, they each must file a motion (or a joint motion) to seal within one week of the issuance of the O&O, specifying those filings or portions of filings as to

which they submit sealing is warranted.¹ In approaching this issue, the parties must be mindful that redactions should be minimized, wherever possible, in light of the strong presumption of public access to judicial documents. *See Brown v. Maxwell*, 929 F.3d 41, 47-48 (2d Cir. 2019); *Lugosch v. Pyramid Co. of Onondaga*, 435 F.3d 110, 119-20 (2d Cir. 2006).

Second, within that same time period, the parties must meet and confer in good faith and then submit (by email to GSteinNYSDChambers@nysd.uscourts.gov) their proposal(s) as to what (if any) redactions should be made to the text of the O&O before it is publicly filed on the docket. In approaching this issue, the parties should be aware of the Court's current view that the O&O is written in such a way as to obviate the need for any redactions. However, if the parties disagree, they are free to explain why the Court should reach a different conclusion.

SO ORDERED.

DATED: New York, New York
June 18, 2025



GARY STEIN
United States Magistrate Judge

¹ For the avoidance of doubt, the parties need not address Docket No. 110, which includes the 20 disputed documents submitted for *in camera* review and will remain under seal.